

**Miller, Diane M. (CDC/NIOSH/EID)**

---

**From:** .  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 28, 2007 10:54 PM  
**To:** NIOSH Docket Office (CDC)  
**Subject:** 103 - Endicott Project Comments

Here's some comments some folks posted from the newspaper article:

Well, you don't have to pay me 3.1 million dollars to tell you that something is causing cancer in employees that worked for IBM for extended periods of time. Especially to those that also lived within close proximity of the plant. I am not from this area, but have lived and worked here now for about . years. I worked for EIT for about . years, and I saw 3 employee's that worked for IBM previously, die from cancer. One of them was a manager that I knew very well. It only took months for his health to deteriorate. I still work on the IBM campus, and I worry everyday if I am being exposed to anything that might affect me in 20 years. It's just sad that IBM is acting this way in response to employee's they claim to hold so dear.

Posted by: **mamaofdil&eth** on Wed Mar 28, 2007 7:49 pm

IBM insiders knew full well the extent of the chemical "plume" beneath vast residential areas of Endicott but kept their mouths shut out of fear of losing their jobs. Fat good that did us. Some insiders also knew that at one point, more chemicals were being recovered than had been reported spilled -- pointing to leaks and unreported spills through negligence, incompetence or ciminal acts, if true.

Both total reported spills, leaks and "emissions" and total amounts recovered by chemical type should be quite findable -- and made public.

Posted by: **stevie** on Wed Mar 28, 2007 7:19 pm

You say "Who cares about the privacy rights when they are dead?" Hmmm, their families? Also, the information to be released is about everyone who ever worked in an area of possible exposure (or possibly everyone who ever worked anywhere on the site). So, I guess those folks and their families, mostly living, might care. As for paying for insurance for those with chemical related cancers, I doubt it will ever be proven conclusively that the exposure to chemicals used at the plant was a direct cause of those illnesses.

Posted by: **workingman** on Wed Mar 28, 2007 5:41 pm

One of the reasons that IBM does NOT want a study of workers health is because I believe the cancer rates are so high for employees that IBM is worried it will cost them a bundle in lawsuits. They are hoping to drag this out as long as possible because the more employees that die will be the less for them to worry about. I also believe that IBM should at least have the decency to pay the health insurance for the people with related chemical cancer. I say all this, because most of the people I know who worked there died from various types of cancer. Who cares about the privacy rights when they are dead? ☹

Posted by: **PitchGod** on Wed Mar 28, 2007 5:19 pm

Quote: "Why has it taken so long to finally look at IBM's records?" The answers are in the article. (1) the fact that there is a high incidence of cancers, etc. was only verified relatively recently (August 2005), (2) the study will cost \$3.1 M dollars (where does that come from?), and (3) IBM has resisted giving out the data on employees because of privacy concerns.

Posted by: **workingman** on Wed Mar 28, 2007 3:51 pm

I worked there and the conditions were terrible in regard to breathing in chemical fumes. We definitely need a safety study.

Provider:

\*\*\*\*\*

See what's free at <http://www.aol.com>.